

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION**

BRENDA J. COOPER, ET AL.
versus
MERITOR, INC., ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS
Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-52-DMB-JMV
DEFENDANTS

- Consolidated With –

JOE E. SLEDGE, ET AL.
versus
MERITOR, INC., ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS
Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-53-DMB- JMV
DEFENDANTS

- and -

KATHERINE LONGSTREET COOKE, ET AL.
versus
MERITOR, INC., ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS
Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-54-DMB-JMV
DEFENDANTS

- and -

SRA INVESTMENTS, LLC, ET AL.
versus
MERITOR, INC., ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS
Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-55-DMB-JMV
DEFENDANTS

- and -

FELICIA WILLIS, ET AL.
versus
MERITOR, INC., ET AL.

PLAINTIFFS
Civil Action No. 4:16-cv-56-DMB-JMV
DEFENDANTS

ORDER

This matter is before the court on the Plaintiffs’ motion to compel “chemical fingerprinting” data and factual information provided to Defendants’ retained experts, Ranjit Machado and Robert Powell. For the reasons discussed below, the motion is denied.

In support of their motion, Plaintiffs cite no legal authority and only contend, in conclusory fashion¹, that Defendants’ retained experts, Machado and Powell, received certain “chemical fingerprinting” facts and data.

¹ Indeed, Plaintiffs merely refer the court generally to over 35 pages of deposition testimony, most of which appears to have nothing to do with the aforementioned facts and data.

In their opposition, Defendants cite specific deposition testimony of the retained experts, affirming that they neither received nor reviewed any facts or data concerning “chemical fingerprinting.” This assertion was further specifically made by counsel for Defendants, who represents to the court that Plaintiffs’ assertion that “chemical fingerprinting” data and/or analysis was revealed to the retained experts is untrue.

On this record, and absent even a reply by Plaintiffs in support of the motion, the undersigned is unpersuaded that there is any basis to compel these retained expert witnesses to produce anything—particularly that which they represent they have never been provided and did not consider in formulating their opinions.

SO ORDERED this 28th day of December, 2017.

/s/ Jane M. Virden
U. S. Magistrate Judge